

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 25 and 26 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least at FIG. 3 of the present application and therefore no new matter has been added. No claims have been currently added or cancelled.

Claims 1-30 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 8, 16 and 25 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the present amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 1-24 are indicated as allowed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102:

Claims 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,449,586 to Hoshumaya ("Hoshuyama"). Applicants traverse the rejections and respectfully request reconsideration.

Amended independent claim 25 recites at least the following:

the adaptive feedback filtering being performed with adaptive blocking filters and adaptive canceling filters connected in a feedback structure

Hoshuyama fails to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features of amended independent claim 25. Referring to FIG. 1 of Hoshuyama, adaptive filters 5_0 to 5_{m-1} and adaptive filters 7_0 to 7_{m-1} have a feedforward connection structure, in contrast to the above-recited claim language. Further, Hoshuyama fails to even mention the term "feedback." In this sense, Hoshuyama is similar to the conventional adaptive beamformer described, for example, in the *Description of the Related Art* portion of the above-identified application at (pars. [0007] to [0013]).

In addition, the Office Action notes on page 4, last paragraph, that Hoshuyama fails to disclose "...with the adaptive block filter and canceling filters being connected in a feedback structure..."

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 25 patentably distinguishes over Hoshuyama, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-30, which depend from independent claim 25,

should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Amended dependent claim 26 recites at least the following:

wherein the adaptive blocking filters having the predetermined coefficients and the adaptive canceling filters having the predetermined coefficients are respectively connected in a feedback structure.

Hoshuyama, fails to suggest or disclose at least all the above-recited features of claim 26.

The Office Action asserts on page 6 that Hoshuyama illustrates all of the above-recited features at FIG. 1, items 4 and 5. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hoshuyama illustrates a plurality of adaptive filters, 0 through M, at FIG.1, item 5. However, the filters of Hoshuyama have a feedforward connection structure, in contrast to the "feedback structure" recited above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 26 patentably distinguishes over Hoshuyama, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 27-30, which depend from independent claims 26, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 10, 2008

By: 

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501